



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,010	06/28/2005	Gunter Saliger	66489-061-7	9017
25769 7590 03/21/2008 DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC FRANKLIN SQUARE, THIRD FLOOR WEST 1300 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER SRIVASTAVA, TARUN K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
4153				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/21/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/541,010

Applicant(s)

SALIGER ET AL.

Examiner

TARUN K. SRIVASTAVA

Art Unit

4153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/28/05

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 – 5 and 8 – 9 and 13 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rekow (USPN 5,273,429).

Regarding claims 1, 8 – 9, and 13 – 14, Rekow teaches a method of fabricating a suprastructure for an implant via digital model descriptions with the steps of:

- recording a clinical situation as digital data (Figure 8, Element 40);
- analyzing this situation and determining the implant axis (42);
- computing the optimum shape (48);
- fabricating the elements from blanks (50);
- one element of the suprastructure comprising a cap and a reduced crown;
- calculating the final size of the suprastructure with its final dimensions where the exterior dimensions are smaller than the exterior dimensions while retaining the mating surface (Detailed Description of Invention)

Art Unit: 4153

With respect to claims 2 - 4, Rekow substantially discloses a mating surface between two elements of the suprastructure (Figure 9) and two parameters, namely the tilt angle (78) and the angle of rotation (84), in addition to optimizing the tilt angle (78).

In terms of claim 5, Rekow discloses a shape of said blank and suprastructure to be described in the coordinate system of the geometry for attachment (Paragraph 3 of Detailed Description).

NOTE: Applicant does not define 'reduced crown,' thus examiner takes it to mean a crown of relatively smaller size.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 6 – 7 and 11 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rekow in view of Schroeder (USPN 5,359,511).

Rekow teaches a method as above, but fails to adequately disclose a characteristic whereby the determination of the axis of the implant is effected interactively, and in such a system where the suprastructure comprises a crown and an abutment, where the abutments are connected by a common frame construction. However, Schroeder does disclose such a method (Detailed Description of Invention, specifically columns 3 - 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rekow's method in view of Schroeder user - interaction in order to provide for a more adaptive product.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rekow in view of Rathke (USPN 6,968,247).

Rekow teaches a method as above, but fails to adequately disclose a third element, being a veneer, to be fabricated by said method. However, Rathke does teach a veneer to be fabricated by a digitized method as above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rekow's method in view of Rathke's in order to make a more aesthetically pleasing abutment system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TARUN K. SRIVASTAVA whose telephone number is (571)270-3769. The examiner can normally be reached on M - R 5:30 - 2:00 EST.

Art Unit: 4153

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jackson can be reached on 571-272-4697. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Respectfully,
TKS
/T. K. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 4153
03/15/08

/Gary Jackson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 4153